

**Categorical Exclusion Documentation Format for Actions Other Than Hazardous Fuels
and Fire Rehabilitation Actions**

**Cross Trail Guide Service
DOI-BLM-AZ-P010-2011-025-CX**

A. Background

BLM Office: *Hassayampa Field Office (HFO)*

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: **Insert Lease/Serial/Case File Number, or “N/A” if not applicable**

Proposed Action Title/Type: **Cross Trail Guide Service**

Location of Proposed Action: Bradshaw – Harquahala Planning Area: Yarnell, Prescott, Dewey, Wickenburg, Black Canyon City, Congress, and Aguila

Description of Proposed Action: Provide mountain lion day hunts with the use of 3 horses and 10 dogs. The hunt participants will follow dogs on horseback or foot. Horses and trucks will use existing roads. Most hunts will be on private land, however, they may spill over onto BLM lands and in hunting units: 20A, B, C; 44A and B.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: **Bradshaw Harquahala Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan**

Date Approved/Amended: **4/22/2010**

☒ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

Explain specific or implied decision(s): RR-30 SRPs are authorized on a case by case basis for all recreation activities meeting the requirements in 43 CFR 2930 and applicable manuals, policies, and guidance. SRPs are required for all commercial or competitive use recreation activities. RR-31 Issuance of SRPs is at BLM's discretion.

C: Compliance with NEPA:

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 2, Appendix 1, or 516 DM 11.5: **516 DM 11 H Recreation Management. Issuance of SRP for day use that impacts no more than 3 staging area acres; and/or for recreational travel along roads, trails, or in areas authorized in a land use plan.**

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM 2 or 516 DM 11.5 apply.

I considered: Most hunts will be done with horse and dogs pursuing mountain lions.
Supplemental stipulations are attached to assist to mitigate any management concerns.

D: Signature

Authorizing Official: ____/s/____03/31/2011_____

Steven Cohn
Hassayampa Field Manager

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact:

Mary Skordinsky, 623-580-5586

Note: A separate decision document must be prepared for the action covered by the CX. See Attachment 2.

BLM Categorical Exclusions: Extraordinary Circumstances¹

Attachment 1

The action has been reviewed to determine if any of the extraordinary circumstances (43 CFR 46.215) apply. The project would:		
1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: Most of the hunting will take place on private land. BLM land acts as a cushion in case the mountain lion crosses land ownership boundaries.
2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness or wilderness study areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (Executive Order 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: Impacts will be minimal, similar to the impacts of a casual user.
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)]?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: No highly controversial environmental effects or unresolved conflicts.
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: No highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or unknown environmental risks are foreseen.
5. Establish a precedent for future action, or represent a decision in principle about future actions, with potentially significant environmental effects?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: No environmental effects from a person guiding two people using 3 horses and ten dogs to hunt mountain lions.
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: Hunting is a legal action when appropriate requirements through Arizona Game and Fish are met. This permittee has his paperwork and will guide up to 2 people and collect a fee for this. Because he is collecting a fee makes this more than casual use.
7. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing, on the		

¹ If an action has any of these impacts, you must conduct NEPA analysis.

National Register of Historic Places as determined by either the Bureau or office?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: No more than what a casual user would have, which would be insignificant.
8. Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: Because this hunt is being guided, it is more likely that the appropriate animal will be hunted.
9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: No laws are anticipated to be violated.
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: This action does not negatively impact low income or minority populations.
11. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners, or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: The activity in this Special Recreation Use Permit is not focused on ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites.
12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area, or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: This is not anticipated to occur.

Approval and Decision

Attachment 2

Compliance and assignment of responsibility: Recreation, Mary Skordinsky

Monitoring and assignment of responsibility: Recreation and or Law Enforcement Rangers

Review: *We have determined that the proposal is in accordance with the categorical exclusion criteria and that it would not involve any significant environmental effects. Therefore, it is categorically excluded from further environmental review.*

Prepared by: _____/s/_____ **Date:** 3/17/11

Mary Skordinsky

Project Lead

Reviewed by: _____/s/_____ **Date:** 03/22/2011

Leah Baker

Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Reviewed by: _____/s/_____ **Date:** ___03/31/2011

Steven Cohn

Manager

Project Description:

Paste Project Description here

Decision: Based on a review of the project described above and field office staff recommendations, I have determined that the project is in conformance with the land use plan and is categorically excluded from further environmental analysis. It is my decision to approve the action as proposed, with the following stipulations (if applicable).

Approved By: _____/s/_____ **Date:** 3/31/2011

Steven Cohn, Hassayampa Field Manager